

PLH



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/875,814	06/05/2001	Ashvinkumar J. Sanghvi	MS1-689US	5999

22801 7590 03/31/2004

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2004

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicant(s)

09/875,814

Examiner

Mohammad A Siddiqi

Applicant(s)

SANGHVI ET AL.

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 February 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-29 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Natarajan et al. (6584502) (hereinafter Natarajan) .

4. As per claim 1, Natarajan discloses a method comprising:

Identifying multiple policies to be combined together (figure 2, element 254, col 14, lines 20-27);

determining whether any conflicts exist between the multiple policies (col 14, lines 5-8);

adding non-conflicting policies to a merged policy set (col 14, lines 5-19); and

resolving conflicting policies by selecting a preferred (col 14, lines 5-19) policy and including the preferred policy in the merged policy set (col 14, lines 33-40).

5. As per claims 2 and 15, Natarajan the preferred policy represents a preferred range of values associated with at least one of the multiple policies (col 14, lines 5-19).

6. As per claim 3, Natarajan determining an allowed range of values associated with the multiple policies (col 14, lines 5-19).

7. As per claim 4, Natarajan the preferred policy is contained within an allowed range of values associated with the multiple policies (col 14, lines 5-19).

8. As per claims 5 and 16, Natarajan deleting policies that are outside an allowed range of values (col 14, lines 5-19 and col 14, lines 33-35), wherein the allowed range of values is associated with the multiple policies (col 14, lines 5-19).

9. As per claims 6 and 22, Natarajan selecting a preferred policy includes:

arranging conflicting policy templates in order from global policies to local policies (figure 2, element 270, 274A, 274 B, col 18, lines 40-59);

determining an intersection of the conflicting policy templates (col 30, lines 5-35); and

selecting the preferred policy template based on the intersection of the conflicting policy templates (col 30, lines 5-35).

10. As per claim 7, Natarajan selecting a preferred policy includes:

Arranging conflicting policy templates in order from global policies to local policies (col 18, lines 40-59);

determining an intersection of the conflicting policy templates (col 39-46); and

selecting the preferred policy template based on the policy template closest to the local policies and within the intersection of the conflicting policy templates (col 30, lines 5-35).

11. As per claims 8, 17, and 28, Natarajan the policies are event-handling policies (figure 2, element 270, 274A, 274 B).

12. As per claims 9,18, and 25, Natarajan the policies define how a device is to be configured (col 8, lines 10-38).

13. As per claims 10,26, and 29, Natarajan the policies identify the types of events that are provided to each device (col 10, lines 40-50).

14. As per claim 11, Natarajan resolving conflicting policies includes comparing related policies individually (col 14, lines 2-20).

15. As per claims 12 and 23, Natarajan wherein the method is implemented by a management module (col 19, lines 1-15).

16. As per claims 13 and 19, Natarajan One or more computer-readable memories (figure 5A, element 63,65, lines 46-51) containing a computer program that is executable by a processor to perform (col 12, lines 46-59).

17. As per claim 14, Natarajan discloses A method comprising:
identifying multiple policies to be combined together (figure 2, element 254, col 14, lines 5-8);

determining whether any conflicts exist between the multiple policies (col 14, lines 5-8); adding non-conflicting policies to a merged policy set;

arranging conflicting policies in order from global policies to local policies (figure 2, element 270, 274 A, 274 B, col 18, lines 40-59);

determining an intersection of the conflicting policies (col 14, lines 5-8); and

selecting a preferred policy based on the policy closest to the local policies and within the intersection of the conflicting policies (col 30, lines 5-35).

18. As per claim 20, Natarajan discloses An apparatus comprising:

a storage device configured to store a merged policy set (Col 13, lines 45-57 and col 14, lines 33-42); and

a management module coupled to the storage device and configured to identify multiple policies to be merged into the merged policy set (figure 2, element 260,262,252, Col 19, lines 1-16 and col 14, lines 33-42), wherein the management module adds non-conflicting policies to the merged policy set and resolves conflicts among conflicting policies (Col 13, lines 45-57 and col 14, lines 2-15).

19. As per claim 21, Natarajan discloses resolving conflicts among conflicting policies includes selecting a preferred policy and including the preferred policy in the merged policy set (col 14, lines 5-8).

20. As per claim 24, Natarajan discloses the management module receives event data generated by a plurality of event providers coupled to the management module (figure 2, element 260,262,252, Col 19, lines 1-16).

21. As per claim 27, Natarajan discloses one or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a computer program that (col 12, 60-65), when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to (col 13, lines 4-11):

- identify multiple policies to be combined together in a merged policy set (figure 2, element 254, col 14, lines 20-27);

- determine whether any conflicts exist between the multiple policies; include non-conflicting policies in the merged policy set (col 14, lines 5-8);

- resolve conflicting policies by: selecting an allowed policy range (col 14, lines 5-19);

- selecting a preferred policy range that is included in the allowed policy range (col 14, lines 33-40); and

including the preferred policy range in the merged policy set (col 14, lines 5-19).

Response to Amendment

22. Applicant's arguments filed 02/17/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive:

In response to applicant's argument " Natarajan do not discloses determining conflicts among the policies", the examiner respectfully disagrees. The Natarajan prior art teaches policy engine is a decision making component and triggered by the events or changes, conflict is an event and determining a conflict is done by monitoring an event (col 14, lines 1-8, and col 10 lines 41-55). Therefore, limitations are met by the reference.

In response to applicant's argument " For rejecting resolving conflicting policies", the examiner respectfully disagrees. The Natarajan prior art teaches policy engine is a decision making component and triggered by the events or changes, conflict is an event, determining a conflict is done by monitoring/detecting an event, resolving a conflict is done by making a decision and taking a correct

action (col 14, lines 1-20, and col 10 lines 41-55). Therefore, limitations are met by the reference.

In response to applicant's argument "arranging conflicting policies", the examiner respectfully disagrees. The Natarajan prior art teaches policy engine is a decision making component and triggered by the events or changes, conflict is an event, determining a conflict is done by monitoring/detecting an event, resolving a conflict is done by making a decision and taking a correct action (col 14, lines 1-20, and col 10 lines 41-55), global (WAN) policies (fig 2, element 210), local (LAN) policy (fig 2, element 206A, col 18, lines 40-59), arranging policies means deleting, plug-in, and updating policies (col 14, lines 33-50). Therefore, limitations are met by the reference.

In response to applicant's argument "selecting a preferred policy", the examiner respectfully disagrees. The Natarajan prior art teaches Selecting a policy based on the configuration file and one of the instructions can be closest to the local policies (col 30, lines 10-15). Therefore, limitations are met by the reference. Claims 1, 14, 20, 27 stand rejected

Conclusion

23. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad A Siddiqi whose telephone number is (703) 305-0353. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MAS



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100